

I. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a response to the Final Office Action dated August 4, 2005. Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 12 and 19 have been amended to include the subject matter of claim 7. Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice. Applicant reserves the right to file continuation and/or divisional applications including the subject matter of the originally filed claims and/or any subsequent amended form of the claims.

A. Claim Rejections And Objections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 12-14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,758,023 issued to Bordeaux (hereinafter "*Bordeaux*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,470 issued to Shu (hereinafter "*Shu*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,754 issued to Karaali (hereinafter "*Karaali*"). The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Bordeaux* in view of *Shu* and *Karaali*, and further in view of the Selounai publication entitled "Recognition of Arabic Phonetic Features Using Neural Networks and Knowledge-Based System: a Comparative Study" (hereinafter "*Selounai*"). The Examiner has rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Bordeaux* in view of *Shu* and *Karaali*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,701 issued to Neti (hereinafter "*Neti*"). The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Bordeaux* in view of *Shu* and *Karaali*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,369 issued to Buth (hereinafter "*Buth*"). The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Bordeaux* in view of *Shu* and *Karaali*, and further in view of *Selounai*. The Examiner has rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Bordeaux* in view of *Shu* and *Karaali*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,557 issued to Jeppesen (hereinafter "*Jeppesen*"). The Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Bordeaux* in view of *Shu* and *Karaali*, and further in view of *Selounai*. Finally, the Examiner has rejected

claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Bordeaux* in view of *Shu* and *Karaali*, and further in view of *Buth*.

The Examiner has also objected to claim 7 as being dependent upon rejected base claim 1, but indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 12 and 19 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 7. Therefore, all pending claims contain patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim rejections should be withdrawn.

II. CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection or rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

By, Sandra Brown

Blaney Harper

Date: December 5, 2005

By:	Sandra D. M. Brown	Reg. No. 52,663
For:	Blaney Harper	Reg. No. 33,897
JONES DAY		
222 East 41 st Street		
New York, NY 10017		
(212) 326-3939		